

Remarks:

Claims 1 and 4-9 and 17-20 remain in this case and all claims stand rejected.

In the subject Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 9 and 17-20 as obvious over Schubert in view of Walsh and Helms. The teachings of Schubert and Walsh have been previously discussed in detail, and this discussion will not be repeated here.

Helms, newly cited by the Examiner, teaches an infrared imaging system associated with a camera. Such an imaging system cannot be used in a gambling tracking system as in the present invention due to the nature of the specific target of the imaging system, that is gaming pieces. In many circumstances, the only difference between gaming chips of different value is a difference in color. The chips are otherwise identical. An infrared imaging system, using a single or narrow wavelength of light, would be unable to distinguish between chips of different values, and thus the imaging system would fail in its only purpose.

In response to the Examiner rejection of the claims, claim 1 has been amended to include the features taught on page 12 of the specification regarding chip identification. These feature are neither shown nor suggested in the art, and the Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a phone conference would expedite this case to issue, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned. No additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,



Tim Cook
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,561

Browning Bushman P.C.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77057
(713) 266-5593
(713) 266-5169
tcook@browningbushman.com